

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

IN THE CLAIMS:

Please cancel claim 12 and amend claims 1, 2 and 13 as follows. The following listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (Currently Amended). A method for simultaneously developing a family of complex systems having a common software architecture platform, the family of complex systems including a plurality of complex systems, the method comprising:

- 5 constructing an initial requirements object model which explains abstract concepts in terms of a structured vocabulary, forming an initial set of use cases based on the initial requirements object model such that the use cases are expressed using the structured vocabulary of the requirements object model,
- 10 the use cases describing interaction of users with each of said complex systems in terms of the structured vocabulary explaining the abstract concepts[[]], forming an initial functional requirements specification (FRS) which includes use cases,
- 15 forming an amended requirements object model based on the initial FRS and thus in consideration of the initial set of use cases,

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

forming additional use cases based on analysis of the  
amended requirements object model,

20 changing the FRS in light of the additional [[uses]] use  
cases,

forming another amended requirements object model based on  
the changed FRS simultaneously with the formation of the  
additional use cases,

25 repeating the additional use case formation step, the FRS  
changing step and the amended requirements object model formation  
step until all desired use cases have been formed and considered,  
and

obtaining a final requirements object model once all of the  
30 desired use cases have been considered.

Claim 2 (Currently amended). A method as claimed in Claim  
1, wherein the functional requirements specification (FRS)  
includes one or more chapters, further comprising:

establishing one or more FRS authoring teams for separate  
5 chapters,

designating a single object model control team to control  
internal consistency of the ~~requirement~~ requirements object  
models,

forming one or more overlapping modeling teams where each  
10 modeling team includes members of the object model control team

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

together with one or more members of respective FRS authoring teams, and

providing that overlapping modeling teams for their chapters construct use cases and provide respective portions of the  
15 structured vocabulary.

Claim 3 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in Claim 1, wherein differences between members of the family are expressed in the requirements object models.

Claim 4 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in Claim 2, further comprising:

constructing the initial requirements object model in at least one of the modeling teams,

5 performing the FRS authoring of the use cases on the basis of the initial model, and

performing fine tuning of the use cases by the object model control team.

Claim 5 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in Claim 2, further comprising carrying out FRS authoring of the use cases of several chapters in parallel by the respective FRS authoring teams.

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

Claim 6 (Original). A method as claimed in Claim 1, wherein the complex systems are medical diagnostic imaging systems, notably, diagnostic x-ray examination systems.

Claim 7 (Previously Presented). A family of complex systems, notably a family of medical imaging systems, obtained by the method of claim 1, wherein separate complex systems support respective, different subsets of the use cases.

Claim 8 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in Claim 1, where the precise behavior of one or more use cases differs among members of the family according to variations expressed in the object model, notably by different subclasses of a general class, by different multiplicities of relationships, or by different values of attributes.

Claim 9 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in Claim 1, further comprising the step of expressing differences between members of the family in the requirements object models using at least one of the following mechanisms:

different members of the family are expressed using different subclasses of a generalized class,

different members of the family are expressed using different multiplicities in relationships between classes, and

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

different members of the family are expressed using  
10 different values for an attribute of a class.

Claim 10 (Cancelled).

Claim 11 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in  
Claim 1, further comprising analyzing the requirements object  
models to identify difficulties and shortcomings, the  
requirements object models being amended in light of the  
5 identified difficulties and shortcomings.

Claim 12 (Cancelled).

Claim 13 (Currently Amended). A method as claimed in Claim  
1, further comprising considering the functional requirements  
specification complete when all of the use cases are expressed in  
the ~~terminology defined by~~ structured vocabulary of the final  
5 requirements object ~~models~~ model.

Claim 14 (Previously Presented). A method as claimed in  
Claim 1, wherein since the additional use cases are formed  
simultaneous with the formation of the amended requirements  
object models, the amended requirements object models are thereby

AUG. 4. 2005 4:18PM +1-212-319-5101 customer 01933

NO. 8952 P. 7

Appln. No. 09/801,602  
Amdt. dated August 4, 2005  
Reply to Office Action dated June 7, 2005

formed during the formation of the functional requirements  
specification.

Claim 15 (Cancelled).